

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-17 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

**Pertaining allowable subject matter**

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner considers the subject matter of claims 2, 3, and 6 as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have not yet rewritten these claims in independent form since they believe that the independent claim from which they depend is already allowable.

**Pertaining rejection under 35 USC §102**

Claims 1, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Neag et al. (USP 5,685,046). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the Neag et al. reference shows a positioning base 70 with a spinning portion 77, a position limiting portion 152, a receiving groove 95 with flexible member 92, a touching member 99, rotating base 51 with a rotating portion 62', limiting portion 130 and a slipping portion 103. Applicants disagree that the present claims are anticipated by this reference.

First, it is noted that the hinge shown in the reference is for use on a rear door of a truck. This differs from the present invention which is designed to connect a main body of an electronic device with the cover body. In particular, the present invention is designed for devices such as a notebook computer to allow the display to be rotated so that it can be viewed easily by the user and others who are sharing the display. Further, the present invention is designed to allow the cover body to hinge open from the main body and then rotate. The device shown in the reference basically pivots in a simple opening fashion except that the U-shaped link allows the door to open more fully.

In particular, in regard to claim 1, the claim has been amended to make it clear that the hinge is designed for use with an electronic equipment and the positioning base is mounted on

the main body of the electronic device. This is clearly not seen in the Neag et al. reference. Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable.

Furthermore, Applicants note that claim 1 describes that the positioning base is provided with a position limiting portion to provide for a rotational range and that the rotating base is provided with the limiting portion corresponding to the position limiting portion. The Examiner has identified these portions with the roller wheel cam follower 152 and the first recess terminus 130. Applicants submit that these elements do not constitute a position limiting portion and a limiting portion to provide a rotational range. Instead, in the arrangement shown in the reference, these elements do not limit the range of the movement of the door, but only provide a mechanism for allowing the door and the U-shaped link to move together for allowing the door to move separately to its full range of movement. Accordingly, Applicants submit that at least this element is not seen in the reference. Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite other features to make these claims additionally allowable. The Examiner has already indicated that claims 2, 3, and 6 are allowable over this reference. In regard to claim 5, it is further noted that this claim describes the rotating base as having an upper shaft base and a lower rotating base assembled to each other. Applicants submit that element 51 which the Examiner has identified as the rotating base does not include two such bases. Accordingly, Applicants submit that this claim is additionally allowable.

Applicants have also added new dependent claims 7-17 to further define allowable limitations over the references. Thus, these claims further recite that the hinges are used for a portable electronic device and other claims describe the specific devices. Further, the claims point that the two axes of movement are perpendicular, which is not seen in the reference. Also, the claims describe that the limit for the rotation is to prevent damage to the wires which is not seen in the reference. Also, the claims describe the upper and lower bases being arranged with the spinning portion being placed therebetween, which is not seen in the reference. Applicants submit that these claims are also allowable over the cited art.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patent relied on by the Examiner. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 CFR §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 13, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd.

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant